# A numerical relativity scheme for cosmological simulations

David Daverio[1,2,3],* Yves Dirian[1],† and Ermis Mitsou[1,4,5]‡
[1] *Department of Theoretical Physics and Center for Astroparticle Physics, University of Geneva, 24 quai Ansermet, CH–1211 Genève 4, Switzerland*
[2] *African Institute for Mathematical Sciences, 6 Melrose Road, Muizenberg, 7945, South Africa*
[3] *Centre for Theoretical Cosmology, Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom*
[4] *Physics Department and Institute for Strings, Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA and*
[5] *Center for Theoretical Astrophysics and Cosmology, Institute for Computational Science, University of Zurich, CH–8057 Zürich, Switzerland*

Fully non-linear cosmological simulations may prove relevant in understanding relativistic/non-linear features and, therefore, in taking full advantage of the upcoming survey data. We propose a new 3+1 integration scheme which is based on the presence of a perfect fluid (hydro) field, evolves only physical states by construction and passes the robustness test on an FLRW space-time. Although we use General Relativity as an example, the idea behind that scheme is applicable to any generally-covariant modified gravity theory and/or matter content, including a $N$-body sector.

arXiv:1611.03437v1 [gr-qc] 10 Nov 2016

## I. INTRODUCTION

The upcoming large scale structure observations will provide a powerful probe of relativistic/non-linear effects in cosmology, such as those encountered in alternative dark physics, matter-radiation interactions, neutrinos, cosmic defects, the inflationary phase, etc. This motivated some recent developments in going beyond the standard simulation techniques that are the linear-Boltzmann and Newtonian $N$-body approaches. These include the first relativistic $N$-body code [1–4], where the gravitational field is treated through an appropriately truncated second-order perturbation theory [1, 5, 6], a Newtonian $N$-body code that includes linearized radiation [7, 8] and a Boltzmann method for describing non-linear effects of massive neutrinos [9]. At the same time, fully non-linear simulations have been performed to study aspects of both the early and late universe, using standard schemes of numerical relativity (NR, [10–15] for reviews). There are simulations of the inflationary epoch in $1+1$ [16–19] and $3+1$ [20–22] dimensions, and $3+1$ simulations involving a pressureless perfect fluid [23–27], mainly motivated by the issue of late-time backreaction.

Now NR has been developed to deal with strong gravity phenomena at astrophysical scales, in which case the scenarios of interest involve localized (if not absent) matter that is modeled hydrodynamically. This is in sharp contrast with cosmology, where gravity is weak, matter is totally delocalized and where the $N$-body approach is the appropriate one for simulating shell-crossing cold matter. It therefore becomes relevant to look for new NR schemes that are adapted to the cosmological context.

A first new feature in that context is that the field fluctuations may contain growing modes already at the linear level (e.g. the density contrast of a hydro field) and these generically enhance numerical instability. For instance, in [24] it was shown that the BSSN scheme [28, 29], along with fluid equations in flux-conservative form [12], could not provide a bounded constraint violation for a perturbed FLRW space-time in the synchronous gauge, even in the presence of constraint-damping terms. In that set-up, both the matter and gravitational fields contain growing linear modes. Therefore, avoiding such modes should be taken into account when choosing the gauge and the combinations of fields that are being evolved.

Another issue in cosmological NR has to do with the diffeomorphism constraints. Their conservation is already a highly non-trivial accomplishement for an NR scheme and it would be further endangered if one considers a $N$-body sector. Indeed, although NR $N$-body simulations have not yet been performed to our knowledge, one issue we might already expect to encounter is constraint violation due to the particle-mesh operations. These are non-unique ad hoc manipulations which must obey some consistency checks, such as the absence of fictitious self-forces on the particles, and thus have less room to also be compatible with the constraints [30].

Here we present a new $3+1$ NR scheme, based on the presence of a perfect fluid field, which lies *exactly* on the constraint hypersurface. After discussing the main idea and some applications, we give the actual choice of variables and gauge for which our ongoing numerical tests are satisfying. Focusing on the case where the perfect fluid is the only matter content, we show the absence of growing modes at the linearized level and corroborate this numerically by successfully performing, for the first time, a robustness test on a FLRW space-time (see [31, 32] for standard NR testbeds). Our equations are derived most conveniently, especially in the presence of extra matter, in the action-based formalism of perfect fluid dynamics [33–36] given in appendix A. Its covariant canonical formulation on curved space-time and for arbitrary equation of state has not appeared elsewhere to our knowledge.

* dd415@damtp.cam.ac.uk
† yves.dirian@unige.ch
‡ ermitsou@physik.uzh.ch

## II. THE GENERAL IDEA

Our key observation is that, in the presence of a minimally-coupled perfect fluid field, one can solve the constraints algebraically. This eliminates the fluid components and thus transfers all the physical information in the gravitational fields alone. The latter therefore obey a closed set of *unconstrained* evolution equations which, in the case of General Relativity (GR) and in "standard ADM form", read (see appendix A)

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta)\,\gamma_{ij} = -2\alpha K_{ij}\,, \tag{1}$$

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta)\,K_{ij} = -\alpha\left[2K_{ik}K^k_j - K_{ij}K - R_{ij} + \Lambda\gamma_{ij} + \mathcal{H}_{ij} - \frac{1}{2}\,\gamma_{ij}\left(\mathcal{H}^k_k - \mathcal{H}\right)\right] - \nabla_i\nabla_j\alpha\,. \tag{2}$$

Here $\alpha$, $\beta^i$ are the lapse and shift constituting the normal frame $n := \alpha^{-1}\left(\partial_t - \beta^i\partial_i\right)$, $\gamma_{ij}$ and $K_{ij}$ are the metric and extrinsic curvature of the spatial hypersurfaces $\Sigma_t$, $R_{ij}$ and $\nabla$ are the Ricci tensor and Levi-Civita connection of $\gamma_{ij}$, $\Lambda$ is the cosmological constant and

$$\mathcal{H} := -\frac{1}{2}\left(K_{ij}K^{ij} - K^2 - R\right) - \Lambda\,, \tag{3}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_i := \nabla_j K^j_i - \nabla_i K\,, \tag{4}$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{ij} := \gamma_{ij}p + \frac{\mathcal{H}_i\mathcal{H}_j}{\mathcal{H}+p}\,, \tag{5}$$

are the on-shell canonical energy, momentum and stress densities of the fluid (in $8\pi G = c = 1$ units). Finally, $p$ is the fluid's rest-frame pressure, which, along with the rest-frame energy density $\rho$, obey the on-shell relation

$$(\mathcal{H}-\rho)\,(\mathcal{H}+p) = \mathcal{H}_i\mathcal{H}^i\,, \tag{6}$$

so the equation of state $p = p(\rho)$ allows one to close the system. Thus, $\gamma_{ij}$ and $K_{ij}$ parametrize the constraint hypersurface of phase space of the full GR + hydro system, i.e. we only have physical states by construction. Constraint violation is now simply translated into a misestimation of the hydro quantities $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}_i$.

To get more insight into how the gravitational and fluid field degrees of freedom (DOF) coexist inside $\gamma_{ij}$ and $K_{ij}$ let us linearize (1) and (2) around a flat FLRW background. Since we are only interested in the spectrum, we can look at small enough scales/periods and thus effectively set the scale factor to 1. We decompose harmonically

$$\alpha = 1 + \psi\,, \tag{7}$$

$$\beta^i = \partial^i\chi + \chi^i\,, \tag{8}$$

$$\gamma_{ij} = (1-2\phi)\,\delta_{ij} + 2\partial_i\partial_j h + 2\partial_{(i}h_{j)} + 2h_{ij}\,, \tag{9}$$

i.e. all vectors/tensors have zero divergence/trace, and displace the indices using $\delta_{ij}$. We get two wave equations

$$\ddot{\phi} = \bar{c}_s^2\partial^2\phi\,, \qquad \ddot{h}_{ij} = \partial^2 h_{ij}\,, \tag{10}$$

where $c_s^2 := \mathrm{d}p/\mathrm{d}\rho$ is the speed of sound and appears through the perturbation of $p$ in $\mathcal{H}_{ij}$, using the fact that $\rho = \mathcal{H}$ at the linear level. We see that the gravitational potential $\phi$ is now dynamical and carries the sound DOF. In vacuum GR we have that $\bar{c}_s^2 \to 1$, but $\phi$ has no DOF because of the Hamiltonian and (the divergence of) the momentum constraints. Moving on to the $h$ component, and using a first-order form, we get

$$\dot{h} = \pi + \chi\,, \qquad \dot{\pi} = -\phi + \psi\,, \tag{11}$$

so no DOF here since we can trivialize the evolution of both fields by choosing appropriately $\chi$ and $\psi$. Finally,

$$\dot{h}_i = \pi_i + \chi_i\,, \qquad \dot{\pi}_i = 0\,, \tag{12}$$

so we only have the two DOF in $\pi_i$ corresponding to the rotational velocity of the fluid. In vacuum GR the latter are neutralized by the rotational part of the momentum constraint. Thus, the four DOF of the fluid $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}_i$ lie in the lower helicity modes of the gravitational field that are now unconstrained. Evolving the fluid information through gravity solves the problem of growing linear modes, because the gravitational perturbations are bounded in the appropriate gauge. The fact that $\alpha$ and $\beta^i$ are undetermined is therefore crucial, and this should be contrasted with the unconstrained formulation of [34] which is defined in a specific gauge only.

The case of voids $\mathcal{H} = p = 0$ might seem singular, because of (5). However, as one might expect, from equation (A5) we find that $(\mathcal{H}+p)^2 \geq \mathcal{H}_i\mathcal{H}^i$, so the numerator in $\mathcal{H}_i\mathcal{H}_j/(\mathcal{H}+p)$ tends faster to zero than the denominator. One can thus safely set $\mathcal{H}_{ij} \to \gamma_{ij}p$ by hand as soon as $\mathcal{H}$ goes below some threshold value.

Finally, note that this "de-constraining" procedure can be performed in any generally-covariant theory of gravity, because the fluid energy and momentum densities will always appear linearly in the diffeomorphism constraints. Furthermore, it generalizes straightforwardly to the presence of extra matter content, a relevant example being the case of $N$ minimally-coupled point-particles with positions $x^i_a(t)$ and momenta $p^a_i(t)$. One must then add the following terms to equations (2), (3) and (4)

$$\Delta\left[\mathrm{rhs}(2)\right] = -\alpha\sum_{a=1}^{N}\frac{p^a_i p^a_j + \frac{1}{2}\,\gamma_{ij}m_a^2}{\sqrt{m_a^2 + p^a_k p^{a,k}}}\,\frac{\delta^{(3)}(\vec{x}-\vec{x}_a)}{\sqrt{\gamma}}\,, \tag{13}$$

$$\Delta\left[\mathrm{rhs}(3)\right] = -\sum_{a=1}^{N}\sqrt{m_a^2 + p^a_i p^{a,i}}\,\frac{\delta^{(3)}(\vec{x}-\vec{x}_a)}{\sqrt{\gamma}}\,, \tag{14}$$

$$\Delta\left[\mathrm{rhs}(4)\right] = -\sum_{a=1}^{N}p^a_i\,\frac{\delta^{(3)}(\vec{x}-\vec{x}_a)}{\sqrt{\gamma}}\,, \tag{15}$$

where $p^{a,i} := \gamma^{ij}(\vec{x}_a)\,p^a_j$, while equation (6) remains the same. The particles are evolved through their equations of motion, i.e. the geodesic equation in first-order form

$$\dot{x}^i_a + \beta^i(\vec{x}_a) = \alpha(\vec{x}_a)\,\frac{p^{a,i}}{\sqrt{m_a^2 + p^a_j p^{a,j}}}\,, \tag{16}$$

$$\dot{p}^a_i = \alpha(\vec{x}_a)\,\frac{p^a_k p^{a,j}\Gamma^k_{ji}(\vec{x}_a)}{\sqrt{m_a^2 + p^a_l p^{a,l}}}\,. \tag{17}$$

## III. SOME APPLICATIONS

Whatever the matter content, our scheme must contain a minimally-coupled perfect fluid field in order to "deconstrain" itself, so we should think about its possible interpretations. At a purely theoretical level, there are interesting subjects one can investigate about GR with a global perfect fluid, such as the backreaction of fluctuations on the background evolution for instance [23, 26].

In the case of structure formation simulations, where the cold dark matter distribution is sampled using particles, a natural choice would be to associate the hydro field with baryons. Unfortunately, the complexity of baryonic physics is hardly captured by a perfect fluid approximation at scales below $\mathcal{O}(1)$ Mpc [37–40], so this depends on the scale or the degree of realism one wishes to reach.

One can also consider no hydro field at all, that is, to avoid giving it a physical interpretation and keep its density intentionally close to zero (with the aforementioned numerical trick $\mathcal{H}_{ij} \to \gamma_{ij} p$). Interestingly enough, this then provides an elegant mechanism for enforcing constraint conservation on the physical components (gravity + other matter). Indeed, starting with no "fluid" $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_i = 0$, i.e. on the constraint surface, and considering an equation of state $p = \rho/3$, any local constraint violating fluctuation will be diluted because of pressure, since small-amplitude radiation does not cluster inside the horizon. The tendency of the equations should thus be to hold the system around the constraint surface, but this remains to be explored numerically.

## IV. THE INTEGRATION SCHEME

Let us now rewrite the GR + hydro equations (1) to (5), i.e. without extra matter, in the form which provides a better numerical behavior. We start by decomposing $\gamma_{ij}$ and $K_{ij}$ in the conformal/traceless fashion

$$\gamma_{ij} = e^{4\phi}\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}\,, \qquad K_{ij} = e^{4\phi}\left(\tilde{A}_{ij} + \frac{1}{3}\,\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}K\right)\,, \quad (18)$$

where $\det\tilde{\gamma}_{ij} \equiv 1$, $\tilde{\gamma}^{ij}\tilde{A}_{ij} \equiv 0$ and all indices are displaced using $\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}$ from now on. The above separation, also used in the BSSN scheme [28, 29], is especially important in cosmology because it distinguishes the fields with a non-trivial background $\phi$, $K$ from the rest $\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}$, $\tilde{A}_{ij}$. We then consider the following slicing

$$\alpha = a^2 e^{-2\phi}\,, \qquad a(t) := \left(\frac{\int \mathrm{d}^3x\, e^{6\phi}}{\int \mathrm{d}^3x}\right)^{1/3}\,. \quad (19)$$

On a FLRW space-time, both $a$ and $e^{2\phi}$ (and thus $\alpha$) reduce to the scale factor, so this is a non-linear generalization of conformal time. This choice is mostly out of convenience, because the propagating fluctuations have a constant frequency with respect to that time.

Next, we consider the gauge $\tilde{\Gamma}^i := -\partial_j\tilde{\gamma}^{ij} = 0$, whose conservation $\dot{\tilde{\Gamma}}^i = 0$ leads to the elliptic equation for $\beta^i$

$$\tilde{\partial}^2\beta^i + \frac{1}{3}\,\tilde{\gamma}^{ij}\partial_j\partial_k\beta^k - 2\alpha\left(\partial_j\tilde{A}^{ij} - 2\tilde{A}^{ij}\partial_j\phi\right) = 0\,, \quad (20)$$

where $\tilde{\partial}^2 := \tilde{\gamma}^{ij}\partial_i\partial_j$ and we have used $\tilde{\Gamma}^i = 0$. In practice, the modified condition $\dot{\tilde{\Gamma}}^i - \alpha\lambda K\tilde{\Gamma}^i = 0$ with $\lambda > 0$ helps the convergence of numerical deviations from $\tilde{\Gamma}^i = 0$. The evolution equations now read

$$\dot{\phi} = -\frac{1}{6}\,\alpha K + \beta^i\partial_i\phi + \frac{1}{6}\,\partial_i\beta^i\,, \quad (21)$$

$$\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}_{ij} = -2\alpha\tilde{A}_{ij} + \beta^k\partial_k\tilde{\gamma}_{ij} + \tilde{\gamma}_{kj}\partial_i\beta^k + \tilde{\gamma}_{ik}\partial_j\beta^k - \frac{2}{3}\,\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}\partial_k\beta^k\,, \quad (22)$$

$$\dot{K} = \frac{\alpha}{2}\left[K^2 - 3\Lambda + \frac{3}{2}\,\tilde{A}_{ij}\tilde{A}^{ij} + e^{-4\phi}\left(\frac{1}{2}\,B + \tilde{\gamma}^{ij}\mathcal{H}_{ij}\right)\right] + \beta^i\partial_i K\,, \quad (23)$$

$$\dot{\tilde{A}}_{ij} = \alpha\left[K\tilde{A}_{ij} - 2\tilde{A}_{ik}\tilde{A}^k_j + e^{-4\phi}\left(B_{ij} - \mathcal{H}_{ij}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right] + \beta^k\partial_k\tilde{A}_{ij} + \tilde{A}_{kj}\partial_i\beta^k + \tilde{A}_{ik}\partial_j\beta^k - \frac{2}{3}\,\tilde{A}_{ij}\partial_k\beta^k\,, \quad (24)$$

where

$$B_{ij} := -\frac{1}{2}\,\tilde{\partial}^2\tilde{\gamma}_{ij} + \tilde{\gamma}^{kl}\tilde{\gamma}^{mn}\left(2\tilde{\Gamma}_{km(i}\tilde{\Gamma}_{j)ln} + \tilde{\Gamma}_{kmi}\tilde{\Gamma}_{lnj}\right) - 8\partial_i\phi\partial_j\phi\,, \quad (25)$$

$$B := \tilde{\gamma}^{ij}B_{ij} = \tilde{\gamma}^{ij}\left(\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{li}\tilde{\Gamma}^l_{kj} - 8\partial_i\phi\partial_j\phi\right)\,, \quad (26)$$

$$\mathcal{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\,\tilde{A}_{ij}\tilde{A}^{ij} + \frac{1}{3}\,K^2 - \Lambda + \frac{1}{2}\,e^{-4\phi}\left(B - 8\tilde{\partial}^2\phi\right)\,, \quad (27)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_i = \partial_j\tilde{A}^j_i - \tilde{A}^j_k\tilde{\Gamma}^k_{ji} + 6\tilde{A}^j_i\partial_j\phi - \frac{2}{3}\,\partial_i K\,, \quad (28)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{ij} := e^{4\phi}\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}p + \frac{\mathcal{H}_i\mathcal{H}_j}{\mathcal{H} + p}\,, \quad (29)$$

"T" denotes the traceless part and $\tilde{\Gamma}^i_{jk} := \tilde{\gamma}^{il}\tilde{\Gamma}_{ljk}$ are the Christoffels of $\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}$. Thanks to $\alpha \sim e^{-2\phi}$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}^i = 0$, the only double spatial derivatives that appear are conformal Laplacians $\tilde{\partial}^2$, a "hyperbolic" characteristic which could be responsible for the good numerical performance.

Note that we have reintroduced constraint equations ($\det\tilde{\gamma}_{ij} = 1$, $\tilde{\gamma}^{ij}\tilde{A}_{ij} = 0$, $\tilde{\Gamma}^i = 0$), but the important difference with the diffeomorphism constraints is that they do not depend on matter. So, had we considered a $N$-body sector, they would be insensitive to the particle-mesh communication.

Finally, let us show that there are no growing linear modes in this gauge for the simpler case of constant equation of state parameter $w := p/\rho$. We thus linearize and

decompose harmonically

$$\phi = \frac{1}{2}\left[\log a + h\right] , \tag{30}$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + 2\left[\left(\partial_i\partial_j - \frac{1}{3}\,\delta_{ij}\partial^2\right)\tilde{h} + \partial_{(i}\tilde{h}_{j)} + \tilde{h}_{ij}\right] \tag{31}$$

$$K = -3H\left[1+\kappa\right] , \tag{32}$$

$$\tilde{A}_{ij} = -H\left[\left(\partial_i\partial_j - \frac{1}{3}\,\delta_{ij}\partial^2\right)\tilde{\kappa} + \partial_{(i}\tilde{\kappa}_{j)} + \tilde{\kappa}_{ij}\right] , \tag{33}$$

$$\alpha = a\left(1-h\right) , \tag{34}$$

$$\beta^i = -aH\left[\left(\partial^i\tilde{\kappa} + \tilde{\kappa}^i\right) + \lambda\left(\partial^i\tilde{h} + \tilde{h}^i\right)\right] , \tag{35}$$

where $a(t)$ is the scale factor and $H(t) := \dot{a}/a^2$ is the Hubble parameter in conformal time. If we further set $\tilde{\Gamma}^i = 0$, then $\tilde{h}$ and $\tilde{h}_i$ vanish. However, we keep these components to verify that the system maintains their amplitude close to numerical error. Going to Fourier space and choosing the time variable $x := \log a$ the equations become

$$\partial_x S = M_s S\,, \qquad \partial_x V = M_v V\,, \qquad \partial_x T = M_t T\,, \tag{36}$$

for the scalar $S := (h, \kappa, \tilde{h}, \tilde{\kappa})$, vector $V := (\tilde{h}_i, \tilde{\kappa}_i)$ and tensor $T := (\tilde{h}_{ij}, \tilde{\kappa}_{ij})$ multiplets with

$$M_s = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & \lambda k^2/3 & k^2/3 \\ X_- - w\tilde{k}^2 & -X_+ & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\tilde{k}^2 & 3w - X_+ \end{pmatrix} , \tag{37}$$

$$M_v = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda & 0 \\ -\tilde{k}^2 & 3w - X_+ \end{pmatrix} , \quad M_t = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\tilde{k}^2 & 3w - X_+ \end{pmatrix} ,$$

where $\tilde{k} := k/(aH)$, $X_\pm := (3/2)\,(1+w)\,(1 \pm \Omega_\Lambda)$ and $\Omega_\Lambda := \Lambda/(3H^2) < 1$. All eigenvalues have negative real part if $\lambda \geq 0$ and $0 \leq w, \Omega_\Lambda < 1$ and strictly negative in the subcase $\lambda, \Omega_\Lambda > 0$. Moreover, the determinant of the eigenvector matrices is non-zero, so that $M_s$, $M_v$ and $M_t$ are diagonalizable and one can thus trust the spectrum to deduce the behaviour.

Having shown the absence of growing linear modes in theory, the remaining (non-trivial) requirement is that the fully non-linear system is able to respect that condition numerically. We thus perform a robustness test, i.e. we consider flat FLRW initial conditions supplemented by a random field perturbation for each evolving field. Its values are drawn with a uniform distribution of amplitude $\varepsilon$ independently at each space point and for each field component (for $K$ we have an additional $H$ factor because of the non-trivial background, see (32)). We work with $\mathrm{Mpc}/h = 1$ units and consider the case $w = 0$, $\Lambda = 0$, $H_0^{-1} = 3000$, from redshift $z = 49$ to 0. We perform the test for three resolutions ($64^3$, $128^3$ and $256^3$ grid points) with periodic boundary conditions and at a fixed physical box size of $L = 1024$, so that we start outside the horizon and end up inside. We pick $\varepsilon = 10^{-12}\Delta x^2$, where $\Delta x$ is the lattice spacing, so that the matter density contrast $\delta \sim \varepsilon\,\partial^2\phi$ is the same for all resolutions. It reaches a maximum value of $\delta \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$ at $z = 0$, so we are in the linear regime. Finally, we use an RK4 integration of (21), (22), (23) and (25) with $\Delta t = \Delta x/10$, imposing the algebraic constraints by hand [32] at each intermediary step. The $\lambda$-modified version of (20) is solved using a Euler-relaxation method [41], $\lambda = 100$ and the $\beta^i$ from the previous time-step as initial conditions. In figure 1 we plot the evolution of the




FIG. 1. Robustness test of a matter-dominated FLRW solution. We plot each $\delta_{...}$ for three resolutions: $64^3$ (top line), $128^3$ (middle line) and $256^3$ (bottom line) grid points.

maximum value in space of

$$\delta_\phi := \left|\phi - \phi_{\mathrm{FLRW}}\right| , \qquad \delta_K := \left|\frac{K - K_{\mathrm{FLRW}}}{K_{\mathrm{FLRW}}}\right| , \tag{38}$$

$$\delta_\gamma := \sqrt{\Delta\tilde{\gamma}_{ij}\Delta\tilde{\gamma}^{ij}} , \qquad \delta_A := \sqrt{\tilde{A}_{ij}\tilde{A}^{ij}} , \tag{39}$$

where $\Delta\tilde{\gamma}_{ij} := \tilde{\gamma}_{ij} - \delta_{ij}$, and the gauge violation

$$\delta_\Gamma := \sqrt{\tilde{\Gamma}_i\tilde{\Gamma}^i} , \tag{40}$$

respectively. We see that the scheme is both robust and converging on a cosmological background. Moreover, the violation of the gauge condition $\delta_\Gamma$ is well controlled in that it decreases with time and its amplitude is several orders of magnitude below the one of $\delta_\gamma$. Further cosmology-oriented tests will be presented in subsequent work [42].

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are very grateful to Julian Adamek, Ruth Durrer, Martin Kunz, Luis Lehner and Joachim Stadel for useful discussions and comments. This work has been supported by several grants of the Swiss National Science Foundation and by a grant from the Swiss National Supercomputing Centre (CSCS) under project ID d55. The simulations have been performed on the Baobab cluster of the University of Geneva, on Piz Daint of the CSCS and on the Cambridge COSMOS SMP system (part of the STFC DiRAC HPC Facility supported by BIS NeI capital grant ST/J005673/1 and STFC grants ST/H008586/1, ST/K00333X/1). YD has been supported by the mobility grant of Heidelberg University, funded by the Excellence Initiative in Germany, and wishes to thank Heidelberg University and the Perimeter Institute for their hospitality during part of the production of this work.

### Appendix A: Canonical perfect fluid field theory

Let us locally parametrize the infinitesimal patches of the fluid by three real numbers $\phi^I$, $I = 1, 2, 3$, i.e. the coordinates of some internal 3-dimensional manifold $\mathcal{F}$ that is diffeomorphic to $\Sigma_t$. The "Lagrangian" description consists in the function $x^i(t, \phi)$, while the "Eulerian" one employs the inverse map $\phi^I(t, x)$, at fixed $t$, which are three scalar fields. By definition, the matrix $\phi^I_i := \partial_i \phi^I$ is everywhere invertible, i.e. $\phi := \det \phi^I_i > 0$, and we denote its inverse by $\phi^i_I$. Taking the time-derivative of the identity $\phi^I\left(t, x(t, a)\right) \equiv a^I$ one gets the 3-velocity field $v^i := \partial_t x^i(t, \phi)\big|_{\phi=\phi(t,\vec{x})} \equiv -\phi^i_I \dot{\phi}^I$. The defining property of a perfect fluid, as opposed to a solid, is the global symmetry of internal volume-preserving diffeomorphisms on $\mathcal{F}$, i.e. $\phi^I \to f^I(\phi)$ with $\det \partial_J f^I = 1$. Indeed, rearranging the fluid patches without compressing them, and without changing the velocity field, must provide a physically equivalent state. The elementary invariant is the 3-form $J := \varepsilon_{IJK}\, \mathrm{d}\phi^I \wedge \mathrm{d}\phi^J \wedge \mathrm{d}\phi^K/3!$, so the most general low-energy effective action reads

$$S_\mathrm{f} = -\int \mathrm{d}^4x\, \sqrt{-g}\, \rho(b)\,, \tag{A1}$$

for a function $\rho$ of $b := \sqrt{|J|^2/3!} \equiv \sqrt{\det g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi^I \partial_\nu \phi^J}$. One can form a time-like unit four-vector

$$U^\mu := \frac{1}{3!}\, \frac{1}{b\sqrt{-g}}\, \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} J_{\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{1}{\alpha}\, \hat{\gamma}\, (1, v^i)\,, \tag{A2}$$

where $\hat{\gamma} := [1 - \alpha^{-2}(v^i + \beta^i)^2]^{-1/2}$ is the generalization of the Lorentz factor to arbitrary space-time, so $U^\mu$ is the 4-velocity field of the fluid. This is consistent with the fact that the convective derivative of $\phi^I$ vanishes identically $U^\mu \partial_\mu \phi^I \sim J \wedge \mathrm{d}\phi^I \equiv 0$. We can now rewrite $b \equiv \phi/(\hat{\gamma}\sqrt{\gamma})$, which makes it the 4-covariant fluid volume density, i.e. the number of fluid patches per space volume. The fluid current is thus $bU^\mu \sim (\star J)^\mu$ and it is identically conserved $\nabla_\mu (\star J)^\mu \sim \mathrm{d}J \equiv 0$. The energy-momentum tensor takes the form

$$T_{\mu\nu} := -\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}}\, \frac{\delta S_\mathrm{f}}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} = (\rho + p)\, U_\mu U_\nu + p\, g_{\mu\nu}\,, \tag{A3}$$

so this is indeed a perfect fluid with rest-frame energy density $\rho$ and rest-frame pressure $p := b\rho' - \rho$. Expressing that equation in terms of the energy and space volume per fluid patch $E := \rho/b$ and $V := 1/b$, respectively, we find the standard relation $\mathrm{d}E = -p\, \mathrm{d}V$ on each patch.

Now the conjugate momenta of $\phi^I$ are $\pi_I = \hat{\gamma}\rho'\phi\, q_{ij} \phi^i_I \phi^j_J \mathcal{L}_n \phi^J$ and one can construct a space covector density out of them $H^\mathrm{f}_i := \pi_I \phi^I_i = -\alpha^{-1}\hat{\gamma}\rho'\phi\, (v_i + \beta_i)$. The canonical action then reads

$$S_\mathrm{f} = \int \mathrm{d}^4x \left[\pi_I \dot{\phi}^I - \alpha H^\mathrm{f} - \beta^i H^\mathrm{f}_i\right]\,, \tag{A4}$$

where

$$H^\mathrm{f} := \sqrt{(r\phi)^2 + H^\mathrm{f}_i H^{\mathrm{f},i}} - \sqrt{\gamma}\, p(r)\,, \qquad r := \rho'\,. \tag{A5}$$

Here we have used the fact that $p$ is the Legendre transform of $\rho(b)$ and thus a function of the Legendre-conjugate variable $r$. When the latter is expressed in terms of the canonical fields $\phi^I$ and $\pi_I$, it will depend in general on $\alpha$ and $\beta^i$ as well. However, this dependence is irrelevant on-shell because when we vary $H^\mathrm{f}$ with respect to any field, the $\sim \delta r$ term from the square root is canceled by the one of $p$ if we use $\partial p/\partial r \equiv b \equiv \phi/(\hat{\gamma}\sqrt{\gamma})$ and the momentum/velocity relation. We can now include the gravitational sector [43, 44] with $8\pi G = c = 1$ to get

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4x \left[\pi_I \dot{\phi}^I + \pi^{ij}\dot{\gamma}_{ij} - \alpha\left(H^\mathrm{f} + H^\mathrm{g}\right) - \beta^i \left(H^\mathrm{f}_i + H^\mathrm{g}_i\right)\right]\,, \tag{A6}$$

where $H^\mathrm{g} \equiv -\sqrt{\gamma}\,\mathcal{H}$, $H^\mathrm{g}_i \equiv \sqrt{\gamma}\,\mathcal{H}_i$ (see (3) and (4)) and $\pi^{ij} \equiv -\sqrt{\gamma}\left(K^{ij} - \gamma^{ij}K\right)/2$. The gravitational equations of motion depend on the fluid only through the combinations $H^\mathrm{f}_i$, $H^\mathrm{f}$ and $p$. We can therefore use the constraints imposed by $\alpha$ and $\beta^i$ to express $H^\mathrm{f}$ and $H^\mathrm{f}_i$ in terms of the gravitational ones. We then get (1), (2), (3) and (4) with $\mathcal{H} = H^\mathrm{f}/\sqrt{\gamma}$ and $\mathcal{H}_i = -H^\mathrm{f}_i/\sqrt{\gamma}$ on-shell. Equating the actions (A1) and (A4) and expressing $\mathcal{L}_n \phi^I$ in terms of $\pi_I$ we then get (6). Finally, to include particles we add the point-particle action $-\int \mathrm{d}\tau \sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}(x)\, \dot{x}^\mu \dot{x}^\nu}$, we Legendre transform with respect to $\dot{x}^i$ and fix the world-line reparametrization symmetry to $x^t = \tau$. Eliminating again the fluid through the constraints we get the full system described in section II.

[1] J. Adamek, D. Daverio, R. Durrer and M. Kunz, Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 10, 103527 (2013), 1308.6524.

[2] J. Adamek, R. Durrer and M. Kunz, Class. Quant. Grav. **31**, no. 23, 234006 (2014), 1408.3352.

[3] J. Adamek, D. Daverio, R. Durrer and M. Kunz, Nature Phys. **12**, 346 (2016), 1509.01699.

[4] J. Adamek, D. Daverio, R. Durrer and M. Kunz, JCAP **1607** (2016) no.07, 053, 1604.06065.

[5] S. R. Green and R. M. Wald, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 063512 (2012), 1111.2997.

[6] S. R. Green and R. M. Wald, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 084020 (2011), 1011.4920.

[7] C. Fidler, T. Tram, C. Rampf, R. Crittenden, K. Koyama and D. Wands, JCAP **1609** (2016) no.09, 031, 1606.05588.

[8] J. Brandbyge, C. Rampf, T. Tram, F. Leclercq, C. Fidler and S. Hannestad, 1610.04236.

[9] A. Banerjee and N. Dalal, 1606.06167.

[10] L. Lehner, Class. Quant. Grav. **18**, R25 (2001), gr-qc/0106072.

[11] E. Gourgoulhon, Lect. Notes Phys. 846, (Springer, 2009), gr-qc/0703035.

[12] J. A. Font, Living Rev. Rel. **11**, 7 (2008).

[13] M. Alcubierre, International Series of Monographs on Physics 140, (Oxford University Press, 2008).

[14] C. Bona, C. Bona-Casas, C. Palenzuela-Luque, Lect. Notes Phys. 783, (Springer, 2009).

[15] M. Shibata, 100 Years of General Relativity, Vol. 1, (World Scientific, 2016).

[16] C. L. Wainwright, M. C. Johnson, H. V. Peiris, A. Aguirre, L. Lehner and S. L. Liebling, JCAP **1403** (2014) 030, 1312.1357.

[17] C. L. Wainwright, M. C. Johnson, A. Aguirre and H. V. Peiris, JCAP **1410** (2014) no.10, 024, 1407.2950.

[18] M. C. Johnson, C. L. Wainwright, A. Aguirre and H. V. Peiris, JCAP **1607** (2016) no.07, 020, 1508.03641.

[19] J. Braden, M. C. Johnson, H. V. Peiris and A. Aguirre, 1604.04001.

[20] K. Clough, E. A. Lim, B. S. DiNunno, W. Fischler, R. Flauger and S. Paban, 1608.04408.

[21] W. E. East, M. Kleban, A. Linde and L. Senatore, JCAP **1609** (2016) no.09, 010, 1511.05143.

[22] W. E. East, J. Kearney, B. Shakya, H. Yoo and K. M. Zurek, 1607.00381.

[23] J. T. Giblin, J. B. Mertens and G. D. Starkman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 25, 251301 (2016), 1511.01105.

[24] J. B. Mertens, J. T. Giblin and G. D. Starkman, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 12, 124059 (2016), 1511.01106.

[25] J. T. Giblin, J. B. Mertens and G. D. Starkman, 1608.04403.

[26] E. Bentivegna and M. Bruni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 25, 251302 (2016), 1511.05124.

[27] E. Bentivegna, 1610.05198.

[28] M. Shibata and T. Nakamura, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 5428 (1995).

[29] T. W. Baumgarte and S. L. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 024007 (1999), gr-qc/9810065.

[30] Note that this issue does not arise in the pertubative approach [3, 4]. There one can harmonically decompose the evolution equations (with respect to the background metric) and therefore choose to solve only part of them, thus using the constraints to close the system.

[31] M. Alcubierre *et al.*, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, 589 (2004), gr-qc/0305023.

[32] M. C. Babiuc *et al.*, Class. Quant. Grav. **25**, 125012 (2008), 0709.3559.

[33] J. D. Brown and D. Marolf, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 1835, gr-qc/9509026.

[34] J. Kijowski and G. Magli, Class. Quant. Grav. **15**, 3891 (1998), gr-qc/9709021.

[35] R. Jackiw, V. P. Nair, S. Y. Pi and A. P. Polychronakos, J. Phys. A **37**, R327 (2004), hep-ph/0407101.

[36] S. Dubovsky, T. Gregoire, A. Nicolis and R. Rattazzi, JHEP **0603**, 025 (2006), hep-th/0512260.

[37] M. P. van Daalen, J. Schaye, C. M. Booth and C. D. Vecchia, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **415**, 3649 (2011), 1104.1174.

[38] M. P. van Daalen, J. Schaye, I. G. McCarthy, C. M. Booth and C. Dalla Vecchia, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **440**, no. 4, 2997 (2014), 1310.7571.

[39] A. Schneider *et al.*, JCAP **1604**, no. 04, 047 (2016), 1503.05920.

[40] A. Schneider and R. Teyssier, JCAP **1512**, no. 12, 049 (2015), 1510.06034.

[41] H. Okawa, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **28**, 1340016 (2013), 1308.3502.

[42] D. Daverio, Y. Dirian, E. Mitsou, (unpublished).

[43] R. L. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. W. Misner, Phys. Rev. **117**, 1595 (1960).

[44] R. L. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. W. Misner, Gen. Rel. Grav. **40**, 1997 (2008), gr-qc/0405109.